

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-27, 29, 31-41, 43-49, and 56-68 were pending and presented for examination. In an Office Action dated June 2, 2008, claims 1, 4-27, 29, 31-41, 43-49, and 56-68 were rejected. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address the Examiner's comments below. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the 4th paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 16, 21, 24, 25, 41, 47, and 56-65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,633,723 ("Sugiyama"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,226 ("Ishikawa") and U.S. Patent No. 6,556,241 ("Yoshimura"). This rejection now is traversed.

Independent claim 1 as amended recites a printer comprising, *inter alia*, "**a multimedia processing system within the printer ... that issues a command that controls the media source to transmit [] time-based media to the multimedia processing system.**"

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, considered alone or in the combination proposed by the Examiner. As a preliminary matter, the Examiner admits that neither Sugiyama nor Ishikawa disclose this element. *See* Office Action dated August 20, 2008, p. 4 ("Office Action" herein).

Yoshimura does not remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama and Ishikawa for several reasons. The Examiner alleges that Yoshimura teaches a "media processing system." *See* Office

Action, p. 2. Applicants respectfully disagree. Yoshimura does not focus on processing media, but rather focuses on processing operation commands, operation demands, and operation results. *See* Yoshimura, FIGS. 5-7. The Examiner also alleges that Yoshimura describes “a way in which a multimedia processing system” can be modified, but does not say what or where Yoshimura allegedly recites such suggestion. *See* Office Action, p. 2. Applicants can find nowhere in Yoshimura that suggests any such modification.

Additionally, none of the elements of Yoshimura **issue a command that controls a media source**. Rather, Yoshimura merely describes clients, a camera server, and a camera controller that *translate* and direct various signals to relay inputs received *from a user* at the client *to a camera apparatus*. *See* Yoshimura, FIGS. 1-4. In contrast, the claimed invention recites a command issued by the multimedia processing system that causes the media source to operate.

Even assuming *arguendo* that relaying or translating user inputs as described by Yoshimura can be interpreted as issuing a command that controls a media source, Yoshimura does not show a multimedia processing system that issues a command that controls a media source to transmit time-based media [**back**] to the multimedia processing system,” i.e., **back to** the same multimedia processing unit **that issued** the command. To the contrary, Yoshimura explicitly recites relaying commands and receiving video signals at *separate* entities. Specifically, in Yoshimura, a first entity (a data processor system) relays an operation command to the camera apparatus, and the camera apparatus sends a video signal to a second entity (a video capture unit). *See* Yoshimura, FIG. 4 and col. 7, lines 13-41. As described by Yoshimura, the video capture system only receives a video signal and *outputs* picture data. *See* Yoshimura, col. 7, lines 15-17. Yoshimura’s video capture unit is therefore unlike the claimed multimedia

processing system at least because it does not **issue a command that controls a media source to transmit time-based media to the multimedia processing system**. Receiving the time-based media enables the claimed multimedia processing system to subsequently distribute a determination of an electronic representation and a printed representation between itself and an external system.

Yoshimura's video capture unit is also unlike the claimed multimedia processing system at least because it is not "within a printer." Indeed, neither "printer" nor "printing" appear anywhere within Yoshimura. As a result, the Examiner is forced to rely on a combination of Yoshimura and the printer of Sugiyama and the printing system of Ishikawa. However, due at least to the above-described deficiencies, such a combination would not yield the claimed invention. At best, a combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura would yield a video printer that accepts and translates *user input* to allow *a user to control* a camera apparatus. The combination would not include "**a multimedia processing system within [a] printer ... that issues a command that controls [a] media source to transmit [] time-based media to the multimedia processing system**."

Not only would a combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura fail to yield the claimed invention, but the Examiner's assertion that the combination would be obvious is misplaced. Yoshimura describes relaying commands to a camera apparatus in a context far removed from any printer. Hence, Applicants submit that the even assuming *arguendo* that the combination of Yoshimura with Sugiyama and Ishikawa would show the claimed elements, one of skill in the art would not be motivated to modify Sugiyama and Ishikawa to include various aspects of Yoshimura as suggested by the Examiner, and would not look to the art of Yoshimura for guidance. It is well understood in the art that static presentation processing (e.g., printers;

class 358 & former class 395) is entirely distinct from television control devices (348), as reflected by the different USCL classifications into which Sugiyama (358), Ishikawa (395), and Yoshimura (348) are placed. Thus, the Examiner’s proposed combination appears to be based on improper hindsight reasoning, with guidance gleaned solely from Applicants’ own disclosure. See MPEP 2145 (Examiner’s rationale may “not include knowledge gleaned only from applicant’s disclosure”).

Applicants note that the standard is not whether the references *can* be combined, but what the combined teachings would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. Specifically, to combine Yoshimura with the other references, Yoshimura’s camera server, camera controller, client, and user would need to be integrated into the printer for the reasons discussed above. At a minimum, this would take the elements of Yoshimura far afield of their “established functions,” precluding the “predictability” of such combining and making it unlikely that the claimed invention would be obvious to those of skill in the art. Thus, the claimed invention is “more than a predictable use of [these] prior art elements according to their established functions.” See *KSR*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1739 (2007).

For at least the above-described reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Independent claim 41 recites a method comprising, *inter alia*, “**issuing a command** from a multimedia processing system within the printer that controls the media source to transmit [] time-based media to the multimedia processing system.” Thus, Applicants submit that arguments similar to those presented above with respect to independent claim 1 are applicable to independent claim 41. Hence, Applicants submit that claim 41 also is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 16, 21, 24, 25, 47, and 56-65 variously depend from claims 1 and 41, which were shown above to be patentable over the cited references. In addition, these claims recite additional features not shown in the cited references. For these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 16, 21, 24, 25, 47, and 56-65 also are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

In the 5th paragraph, claims 4-6 and 43-44 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura and U.S. Patent No. 6,193,658 B1 (“Wendelken”). This rejection now is traversed.

Claims 4-6 and 43-44 variously depend from claims 1 and 41, which were shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, alone or in the suggested combination. Wendelken does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Wendelken is cited merely to show generating a printed output on video paper, storing an electronic output on a media recorder, or storing an electronic output on a removable storage device. Even assuming *arguendo* that Wendelken shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Wendelken of “a multimedia processing system within [a] printer ... that **issues a command that controls the media source** to transmit [] time-based media to the multimedia processing system” or “**issuing a command** from a multimedia processing system within the printer that controls the media source to transmit [] time-based media to the multimedia processing system” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 4-6 and 43-44 are patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and Wendelken, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of their dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 6th paragraph, claims 7 and 45 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Wendelken , U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0220988 A1 (“Hymel”), and US Patent Publication No. 2002/0185533 A1 (“Shieh”). This rejection now is traversed.

Claims 7 and 45 variously depend from claims 1 and 41. Applicants have shown above that claims 1 and 41 are patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and Wendelken, alone or in the suggested combinations.

Neither Hymel nor Shieh, alone or together, remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and Wendelken, nor does the Examiner assert they do. Rather, Hymel is cited merely to show that a removable storage device may be selected from a group consisting of a DVD, a CD-ROM, an audio cassette tape, a video tape and a computer disk and Shieh is cited merely to show that a removable storage device may be selected from a group consisting of a flash card and a memory stick. Even assuming *arguendo* that Hymel and Shieh show that which the Examiner cites them for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Hymel and Shieh of “a multimedia processing system within [a] printer … that **issues a command that controls the media source** to transmit [] time-based media to the multimedia processing system” or “**issuing a command** from a multimedia processing system within the printer that controls the media source to transmit [] time-based media to the multimedia processing system” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 7 and 45 are patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Wendelken, Hymel, and Shieh, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of their dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 8th paragraph claims 9, 11-12 and 18 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and Shieh. This rejection now is traversed.

Claims 9, 11-12 and 18 depend from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and Shieh. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 9, 11-12, and 18 also are patentable over these references, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, for the reasons discussed above.

In the 11th paragraph claims 15, 20, 22, 46 and 48 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Hymel. This rejection now is traversed.

Claims 15, 20, 22, 46 and 48 variously depend from claims 1 and 41, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and Hymel. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 15, 20, 22, 46, and 48 also are patentable over these references, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, for the reasons discussed above.

In the 7th paragraph claims 8 and 38-40 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and Chino US. Patent No. 6,118,888 (“Chino”). This rejection now is traversed.

Claims 8 and 38-40 depend from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, alone or in the suggested combination. Chino does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Chino is cited merely to show an interface comprising an ultrasonic pen capture device or a multimedia processing system comprising an image detection system, a face recognition system, or a speech recognition system. Even assuming *arguendo* that Chino shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Chino of “a multimedia processing system within [a] printer . . . that **issues a**

command that controls the media source to transmit [] time-based media to the multimedia processing system” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 8 and 38-40 are patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and Chino, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of their dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 9th paragraph claim 10 is rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0010641 (“Stevens”). This rejection now is traversed.

Claim 10 depends from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, alone or in combination. Stevens does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Stevens is cited merely to show an interface comprising a wireless communication interface. Even assuming *arguendo* that Stevens shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Stevens of “a multimedia processing system within [a] printer … that **issues a command that controls the media source** to transmit [] time-based media to the multimedia processing system” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 10 is patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and Stevens, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of its dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 10th paragraph claims 13-14 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and U.S. Patent No. 5,436,792 (“Leman”). This rejection now is traversed.

Claims 13-14 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinguishable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, alone or in combination.

Leman does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Leman is cited merely to show an interface comprising a docking station, wherein the docking station is built into the printer. Even assuming *arguendo* that Leman shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Leman of “a multimedia processing system within [a] printer ... that **issues a command that controls the media source** to transmit [] time-based media to the multimedia processing system” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 13-14 are patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and Leman, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of their dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 12th paragraph claims 17, 29 and 33-35 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0048224 (“Dygert”). This rejection now is traversed.

Claims 17, 29 and 33-35 depend from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, alone or in combination. Dygert does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Dygert is cited merely to show an interface comprising a port for connecting a peripheral device, the port selected from a group consisting of SCSI, IDE, RJ11, composite, a multimedia processing system that communicates with a media source (the multimedia processing system not being within a printer and not issuing commands to control the media source), or an interface comprising a database server, wherein the database server comprises a music catalog or a video database. Even assuming *arguendo* that Dygert shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Dygert of “a multimedia

processing system within [a] printer . . . that **issues a command that controls the media source** to transmit [] time-based media to the multimedia processing system” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 17, 29 and 33-35 are patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and Dygert, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of their dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 13th paragraph claim 19 is rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Shieh, Hymel, and U.S. Patent No.5,568,406 (“Gerber”). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 19 depends from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Shieh, and Hymel, alone or in the suggested combinations. Gerber does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Shieh, and Hymel, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Gerber is cited merely to show a removable storage reader comprising a media reader selected from a group consisting of a DVD reader, a flash card reader, a memory stick reader, a CD reader, a computer disk reader, and an SD reader. Even assuming *arguendo* that Gerber shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Gerber of “a multimedia processing system within [a] printer . . . that **issues a command that controls the media source** to transmit [] time-based media to the multimedia processing system” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 19 is patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Hymel, Shieh, and Gerber, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of its dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 14th paragraph claims 23 and 49 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Shieh, Hymel and US. Patent No. 4,881,135 (“Heilweil”).

This rejection now is traversed.

Claims 23 and 49 variously depend from claims 1 and 41, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Shieh, and Hymel, alone or in the suggested combinations. Heilweil does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Shieh, and Hymel, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Heilweil is cited merely to show a media source comprising a media input device selected from a group consisting of a DVD reader, a video cassette tape reader, a CD reader, an audio cassette tape reader, a flash card reader, a digital video recorder, a video capture device, and a meeting recorder. Even assuming *arguendo* that Heilweil shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Heilweil of “a multimedia processing system within [a] printer … that **issues a command that controls the media source** to transmit [] time-based media to the multimedia processing system” or “**issuing a command** from a multimedia processing system within the printer that controls the media source to transmit [] time-based media to the multimedia processing system” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 23 and 49 are patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Hymel, Shieh, and Heilweil, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of their dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 15th paragraph claim 26 is rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and Ohnishi (US Patent 4,807,186). This rejection now is traversed.

Claim 26 depends directly from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, alone or in combination. Ohnishi does not remedy the

above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Ohnishi is cited merely to show a multimedia processing system generating a bar code, the bar code corresponding to a video segment in the video stream. Even assuming *arguendo* that Ohnishi shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Ohnishi of “a multimedia processing system within [a] printer … that **issues a command that controls the media source** to transmit [] time-based media to the multimedia processing system” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 26 is patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and Ohnishi, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of its dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 16th paragraph claim 27 is rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and Huberman (US Patent 6,115,718). This rejection now is traversed.

Claim 27 depends from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, alone or in the suggested combinations. Huberman does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Huberman is cited merely to show a multimedia processing system configured to generate a web page representation of multimedia. Even assuming *arguendo* that Huberman shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Huberman of “a multimedia processing system within [a] printer … that **issues a command that controls the media source** to transmit [] time-based media to the multimedia processing system” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 27 is patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and Huberman, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of its dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 18th paragraph claim 36 is rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Dygert, and Huberman. This rejection now is traversed.

Claim 36 depends from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Dygert, and Huberman. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 36 also is patentable over these references, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, for the reasons discussed above.

In the 17th paragraph claims 31-32 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0169849 (“Schroath”). This rejection is traversed.

Claims 31-32 depend from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, alone or in the suggested combinations. Schroath does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Schroath is cited merely to show a multimedia processing system configured to automatically detect a communicative coupling of a media source or to automatically download multimedia data from the media source. Even assuming *arguendo* that Schroath shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Schroath of “a multimedia processing system within [a] printer … that **issues a command that controls the media source** to transmit [] time-based media to the multimedia processing system” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 31-32 are patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and Schroath, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of their dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 19th paragraph claim 37 is rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and U.S. Patent No. 4,754,485 (“Klatt”). This rejection now is traversed.

Claim 37 depends from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, alone or in the suggested combinations. Klatt does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Klatt is cited merely to show a multimedia processing system comprising a text-to-speech system. Even assuming *arguendo* that Klatt shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Klatt of “a multimedia processing system within [a] printer … that **issues a command that controls the media source** to transmit [] time-based media to the multimedia processing system” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 37 is patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and Klatt, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of its dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 20th paragraph claims 52-55 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and U.S. Patent No. 5,432,532 (“Mochimaru”). Claims 52-55 were cancelled in an Amendment filed April 2, 2008, rendering their rejection moot.

In the 21st paragraph claim 66-67 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0137544 A1 (“Myojo”). This rejection now is traversed.

Claims 66-67 depend from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, alone or in the suggested combinations. Myojo does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Myojo is cited merely to show a multimedia processing system configured to output a status message. Even assuming *arguendo* that Myojo shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Myojo of “a

multimedia processing system within [a] printer ... that **issues a command that controls the media source** to transmit [] time-based media to the multimedia processing system” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 66-67 are patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and Myojo, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of its dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 22nd paragraph claim 68 is rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and U.S. Patent No. 6,556,241 B1 (“Gerszberg”). This rejection now is traversed.

Claim 68 depends from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, alone or in the suggested combinations. Gerszberg does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Yoshimura, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Gerszberg is cited merely to show a multimedia processing system configured to output audio. Even assuming *arguendo* that Gerszberg shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Gerszberg of “a multimedia processing system within [a] printer ... that **issues a command that controls the media source** to transmit [] time-based media to the multimedia processing system” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 68 is patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, and Gerszberg, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of its dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 4-27, 29, 31-41, 43-49, and 56-68, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
PETER E. HART, ET AL.

Dated: November 20, 2008

By: /Jennifer R. Bush/

Jennifer R. Bush, Reg. No. 50,784
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7213
Fax: (650) 938-5200